

REMARKS

A. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

In the Office Action of August 29, 2002, claims 4, 5, 12, 13 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite in meaning. In particular, claims 4 and 12 were rejected for lacking antecedent basis for “said conductors.” Claims 4 and 12 have been amended so that “conductors” is replaced by “connectors” in the manner suggested by the Office Action. Since there is proper antecedent basis for the phrase “said connectors,” the rejection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Please note that the replacement of “conductors” with “connectors” in claims 8 and 12 is being done to correct an obvious typographical error and so is not being done for reasons of patentability as defined in Festo Corporation v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., Ltd., 234 F.3d 558, 56 USPQ2d 1865 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

Claims 10 and 12 were rejected for containing phrases that lacked proper antecedent basis for “said connecting points.” Claims 12 has been amended to delete the offending phrase and claim 10 has been amended to replace the offending phrase with “connectors.” Since there is proper antecedent basis for the terms of claims 10 and 12, the rejection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claims 5, 13 and 17 were rejected because the phrase “a desired position” was deemed indefinite in meaning. Applicant traverses this rejection because the phrase is definite in meaning to one of ordinary skill in the art. Despite the impropriety of the rejection, the word “desired” has been replaced by “predetermined.” Since the phrase “a predetermined position” is definite in meaning, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Please note that the replacement of “desired” with “predetermined” in claims 8 and 12 is

being done solely to expedite prosecution of the application. Since the replacement does not change the meaning of the original claims, the replacement is not being done for reasons of patentability as defined in Festo.

B. 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 9-14 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hsu. Applicant traverses this rejection. Hsu was filed on June 11, 2001. The present application was filed on January 9, 2002 and claims under 35 U.S.C. § 119 the benefit of the March 15, 2001 filing date of German Patent Application No. 101 12 895.9. In order to perfect Applicant's claim, Applicant is concurrently filing with the present Amendment a certified translation of the priority document. Accordingly, the present application has an effective filing date of March 15, 2001 which is prior to the June 11, 2001 filing date of Hsu. Thus, Hsu does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and so the rejection should be withdrawn.

C. 35 U.S.C. § 103

1. Hsu and Sudo et al.

Claims 1-6 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in view of Hsu and Sudo et al. Applicant traverses this rejection because Hsu does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as pointed out above in Section B and so the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

2. Hsu and Taguchi et al.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in view of Hsu and Taguchi et al. Applicant traverses this rejection because Hsu does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as pointed out above in Section B and so the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

3. Hsu, Sudo et al. and Taguchi et al.

Claims 7 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in view of Hsu, Sudo et al. and Taguchi et al. Applicant traverses this rejection because Hsu does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as pointed out above in Section B and so the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the arguments above, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims 1-17 are in condition for allowance and seeks an early allowance thereof. If for any reason, the Examiner is unable to allow the application in the next Office Action and believes that an interview would be helpful to resolve any remaining issues, she is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorneys at (312) 321-4200.

Respectfully submitted,



John C. Freeman
Registration No. 34,483
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER
GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, Illinois 60610
(312) 321-4200

Dated: November 27, 2002

Marked Up Version of Amended Claims

4. (Amended) The device in accordance with claim 2, wherein, starting at said connecting points, one or several of said [conductors] connectors over at least a partial area of said printed circuit board are directed radially away from an axis of rotation of said slip ring unit.

5. (Amended) The device in accordance with claim 2, wherein said geometrically determined pattern of said connecting wires is designed in such a way that said printed circuit board can only be attached in a [desired] predetermined position.

10. (Amended) The device in accordance with claim 9, wherein several ones of said connecting wires are conducted out of said stator in accordance with a geometrically determined pattern, and said [connecting points with said connecting wires on said printed circuit board] connectors are arranged in a pattern that is in accordance with said geometrically determined pattern.

12. (Amended) The device in accordance with claim 10, wherein[, starting at said connecting points,] one or several of said [conductors] connectors over at least a partial area of said printed circuit board are directed radially away from an axis of rotation of said slip ring unit.

13. (Amended) The device in accordance with claim 10, wherein said geometrically determined pattern of said connecting wires is designed in such a way that said printed circuit board can only be attached in a [desired] predetermined position.

17. (Amended) A device for transferring electric currents to, or from a remote-controlled camera, comprising:

✓ ✓ ✓

a slip ring unit comprising a rotor with connecting wires and a stator; and
a printed circuit board fastened to said rotor, said printed circuit board comprising:

connectors that are in electrical contact with a remote-controlled
camera and said connecting wires of said rotor; and
connecting points;

wherein a torque required for rotary movement between said rotor and said stator is introduced via said printed circuit board, wherein an outer portion of said slip ring unit is used as said stator and an inner portion of said slip ring unit is used as said rotor, and several ones of said connecting wires are conducted out of said rotor in accordance with a geometrically determined pattern, and said connecting points with said connecting wires on said printed circuit board are arranged in a pattern that is in accordance with said geometrically determined pattern, wherein said geometrically determined pattern of said connecting wires is designed in such a way that said printed circuit board can only be attached in a [desired] predetermined position.